

imaginative solution than any of the other sorts of attempts that have been made on this bill earlier. But, you know, some issues simply can't be worked out. This bill stands for a very important proposition and that is that there ought to be prejudgment interest running from relatively early in the litigation. Ideally, interest should run from the time of the loss. This bill has been so watered down now that the interest doesn't begin to run until 120 days after service which is probably 125 or 130 days after a suit is instituted and suit is rarely instituted in most cases for six months or a year. And there is an important principle here and maybe it can't be worked out. At least, the industry has shown no genuine interest in working it out because all of their proposals would gut the basic purpose of the bill. And as Senator Beutler has indicated now, their response has been to hire the dean of the lobbying corps, one of the most able lobbyists that this Legislature has ever had, at a retainer that I shudder to even inquire about as to what it must cost and he is bringing his considerable skills to bear to do what? To delay it, to push it off to next session, an election year where the overwhelming power of the insurance industry to influence elections can be brought to bear more effectively than it can be in a nonelection year. So I would ask you all to see what this amendment is. It is an indirect attempt to kill it. What this motion is, it's an indirect attempt to kill it. Let's deal with the issue this session. This is the fourth or fifth time we debated it on the floor this session. We have already spent considerable time on it. Let's wrestle this issue to the ground and come up with a solution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Barrett, then Senator Haberman.

SENATOR BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President and members, I guess it would come as no surprise that I would rise in favor of the bracketing motion. LB 157 has been around the horn a good number of times already this session. I believe it was read first on the 21st day of February. There was an attempt to advance the bill, which failed. I recall even one day that we adjourned this body at 3:45 p.m. just before it was time to vote on whether or not the bill would be advanced or could be advanced. Obviously, at that point it could not or we wouldn't have adjourned. This bill keeps coming back again and again and again. Obviously, the two sides haven't been able to agree at this point but I am not